DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 310 SP 011 161

AUTHOR Curran, John
TITLE Harrison County Teacher Education Center Needs Assessment Survey: A Second Look.
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at 57th Annual Meeting, Association of Teacher Educators (Atlanta, Georgia, February 2-5, 1977); For related document, see ED 124 549

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Coordination; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Needs Assessment; Summative Evaluation; Surveys; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

This paper contains an analysis of the data gathered from the 1975-76 Harrison County Teacher Education Center (HCTEC) needs assessment survey. The orginial study analyzed the opinions of 13 client groups concerning the HCTEC. The study concentrated on two major questions: (1) what are the opinions of the 13 client groups about the perceived needs for the HCTEC; and (2) how do these client groups differ in their opinions of the needs of HCTEC. The results of this study revealed that the existence of a center to perform a wide variety of important functions in Harrison County's educational structure elicited a strong positive reaction from all groups surveyed. Respondents to the original questionnaire suggested some changes in the questions. These suggestions were then reviewed by two out of state consultants who prepared a new survey. A strong continuity of results showed up in the comparison of results from the two surveys despite the changes in the instrument. The only new recommendation in terms of ongoing HCTEC programming concerns the pre-student teacher group. Some unfavorable perception of the center caused college students to shift dramatically in their opinions. Tables are included in appendix A. Appendix B contains the new survey as reviewed, edited and revised by seven teacher education center directors. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141310

HARRISON COUNTY TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY:

A SECOND LOOK

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BY

JOHN CURRAN

APRIL, 1977

SP 011 161

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ---------- 1

ANALYSIS OF DATA ---------- 3

SUMMARY OF DATA COMPARISONS ---------- 7

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ---------- 9

APPENDIX A (TABLE OF RANKED MEAN SCORES) ---------- 10

APPENDIX B (SURVEY INSTRUMENT) ---------- 12

INTRODUCTION

This paper contains an analysis of the data gathered from the 1975-76 Harrison County Teacher Education Center needs assessment survey. A previous document ("An Ananysis of the Opinions of Thirteen Client Groups Concerning the Harrison County Teacher Education Center", by John Curran, published by ERIC, October, 1976, number ED124549) provides details of the 1974-75 HCTEC needs assessment survey.

The HCTEC advisory council analyzed the 1974-75 report and decided to cooperate with the W.Va. State Department of Education plan to collect a second set of data based on a revised questionnaire. Thus this report reflects findings based on the analysis of responses from 12 client groups from a total of 15 on 30 questions (revised from a previous 34).

Respondents to the original questionnaire suggested some changes in the questions. These suggestions were then reviewed by two out of state consultants who prepared a new survey. This new survey was reviewed, edited and revised by the seven teacher education center directors, who produced the final survey. This document is appended to the report.

It can easily be seen that the questionnaires from the two years remained very similar, despite the review process. Sixteen of the 30 questions on the revised questionnaire were taken directly from the original set of questions, while seven more suffered only a slight rewording. A number of other questions were combined and/or dropped, while a small number of new questions were added. Most of

the latter occurred under a new separate heading entitled "Facilitate inservice and continuing education for ···". The original instrument lumped all 34 questions under the heading "A center should ···", while the revised document left 26 under this banner and four under the inservice heading listed above.

Since the instrument was a needs assessment device, no attempt was made to establish either validity or reliability coefficients. Hopefully the analysis of the data will, over a period of time, perform this function by showing a continuity of results.

Because of the pursuit of continuity this report once again addresses the same two research questions:

1. What are the opinions of the various client groups about the perceived needs for the HCTEC?
2. How do the various client groups differ in their opinions of the needs for the HCTEC?

A section containing the analysis of data follows. To facilitate comparison of this report with the previous one, the analysis has been run in the same order, item by item, and the results have been displayed as they were in the previous document. At the conclusion of this analysis a comparison of the major items from the two reports has been assembled in as near tabular form as possible so that the reader may make comparisons with maximum ease.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Once again the initial analysis involved a look at the 30 overall mean scores. All 30 means were positive, ie over 3.00 In fact 14 of them were over 4.00. The lowest means were compiled by the following questions:

Question 14: Encourage the identification of the role of
3.48 school-based coordinator.

Question 16: Promote an interchange of personnel between
3.49 colleges and public schools.

Question 23: Insure participation of consortium members in
3.53 the governance, operation and financing of centers in proportion to benefits received (parity principle).

Question 30: Provide inservice for teachers and other per-
3.55 sonnel in counties and schools not presently involved in a teacher education center.

On the other hand, the following questions generated the highest means, as follows:

Question 2: Provide the pre-student teacher with a greater
4.29 variety of public school experiences prior to student teaching.

Question 1: Facilitate the assignment of student teachers
4.28 through a planned and coordinated system of recruitment and selection of qualified cooperating teachers.

Question 8: Evaluate continuously its program to facilitate
4.27 desirable change.

Question 5: Make available to student teachers selected
4.26 teacher education resource materials.

An examination of the 360 (30x12) individual group means shows that 326 (90.6%) were positive. Eleven were exactly neutral at 3.00, (3.3%) and only 23 (6.1%) were negative. Thus there were only 34 "low" scores, or less than 10%.

Once again two client groups were responsible for most of the low mean scores. Group two (pre-student teachers) compiled 12 negative and seven neutral scores, or 19 of the 34. Group 4 (college supervisors) scored 10 negative and three neutral, or 13 of the remaining 15 low scores.

As in the previous report, the four key groups were analyzed in detail. A "mean of means" was computed for these groups. The results were as follows;

Group 15: 4.08 (Center Governance Board)
Group 3: 3.89 (Student Teachers)
Group 1: 3.86 (Supervising Teachers)
Group 4: 3.08 (College Supervisors)

These groups ranked in the same order as in the 1974-75 report.

The second research question dealt with the degree of homogeneity among the various group responses. A table of the responses appears at the end of this report, with the scores arranged in ascending order from left to right. Any two groups whose scores on a given question are homogeneous are connected by a common underline. The same test (Fisher LSD) was used to determine the meaning of "homogeneous" on both reports.

Taken in pairs, there were a possible 1980 combinations (66x30). Only 544 of these pairs were non-homogeneous. This is 27.5% of the total. Therefore 72.5% of the pairs were homogeneous. This is strikingly similar to last year's record of 72.9%, even though that figure was obtained with 13 groups and 34 questions, or 2652 total pairs.

Each question held 66 pairs of group scores if every possible combination of two groups was considered. Questions which generated the greatest number of homogeneous pairs were:

Question 12: (59) Promote the introduction of new teaching techniques into cooperating schools and member colleges.

Question 29: (59) Provide inservice for supervisors and administrators in county systems involved in the center.

Question 13: (56) Cooperate with public schools in implementing changes in their instructional programs.

Question 23: (55) Insure participation of consortium members in the governance, operation and financing of centers in proportion to benefits received (parity principle).

Question 19: (54) Insure adequate representation in its governing body of all parties (schools, state department, community, student teachers, etc.) concerned with teacher education.

Question 30: (54) Provide inservice for teachers and other education personnel in counties and schools not presently involved in a teacher education center.

The questions which compiled the fewest homogeneous pairs were:

Question 1: (40) Facilitate the assignment of student teachers through a planned and coordinated system of recruitment and selection of qualified cooperating teachers.

Question 11: (40) Assist in the development and initiation of new and changing roles for teachers and college personnel in teacher education.

Question 20: (40) Provide a forum through which public school and college personnel can share any evidence of needed change in teacher education programs.

Question 7: (41) Serve as a vehicle through which information and communication flow among all persons involved in teacher education.

Question 16: (42) Promote an interchange of personnel between colleges and public schools.

The average homogeneity per question was 48 of 66, 72.7%.

Last year's data showed 57 of 78, or 73.1% per question.

A check was run on the homogeneity of the four principal client groups previously mentioned. There were 180 pairs of means involving groups one, three, four and fifteen on the 30 questions. Only 38 of these pairs were heterogeneous, which meant that the inter - group homogeneity averaged 78.9%. The four groups showed complete agreement on 14 of the 30 questions, while two other questions showed only one disparity. Thus just over half of the questions (16 of 30) exhibited little or no significant difference among these four important groups.

As in the previous report college supervisors were involved in most of the non-homogeneous pairs. In fact, they were a part of 35 of the 38 significantly different pairs. This amounts to 92.1% of the total. They disagreed with group one 13 times, group three nine times andgroup 15 13 times.

The other three groups, therefore, were almost totally homogeneous. They agreed as follows:

Groups one and three : all 30 questions (100%)
Groups one and fifteen : 29 of 30 questions (96.7%).
Groups three and fifteeen: 28 of 30 questions (93.3%).

These results show nearly complete agreement between student teachers, center governance board and supervising teachers concerning their perceptions of the HCTEC.

What follows now is a direct comparison of results from the two survey instruments in as direct a form as is possible.

SUMMARY OF DATA COMPARISONS

1. LOW MEAN ON BOTH QUESTIONNAIRES: Questions involving identification of a school-based coordinator and promoting an interchange of personnel between colleges and public schools.

2. HIGH MEAN ON BOTH QUESTIONNAIRES: Questions involving continuous program evaluation and providing inservice for supervising teachers.

3. PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE AND HOMOGENEOUS MEANS:

A. By group: 1974-75 : 419 - 442, 94.79%
1975-76 : 326 - 360, 90.55%.

B. Homogeneity (In Pairs) 1974-75 : 1934 - 2652, 72.92%.
1975-76 : 1436 - 1980, 72.52%.

C. All questions showed positive overall means in both cases.

4. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOW MEAN SCORES:

1974-75: College supervisors: 11 of 23; county central office and community members 5 of 23.

1975-76: Pre-student teachers : 19 of 34; college supervisors, 13 of 34.

5. "MEAN OF MEANS" COMPARISON:

1974 -75	1975 - 76	GROUP
4.56	4.08	Center Governance Board
4.33	3.89	Student Teachers
4.20	3.86	Supervising Teachers
3.64	3.08	College Supervisors

6. AMOUNT OF HOMOGENEITY AMONG ALL GROUPS:

1974-75: 57 of 78 pairs per question, (73.07%).
1975-76: 48 of 66 pairs per question, (72.73%).

7. COMPARISON OF FOUR KEY GROUPS FOR HOMOGENEITY:

A. Homogeneity in Pairs

1974 -75: 147 of 204, 72.1%

1975 -76: 142 of 180, 78.9%

B. Zero or One Homogeneity

1974 -75: 17 of 34 questions, 50%

1975 -76: 16 of 30 questions, 53%

Comparisons Without College Supervisors

	1974-75	1975-76
Supervising Teachers and Student Teachers:	31-34, 91.2%	30-30, 100%
Supervising Teachers and Governance Board:	30-34, 88.2%	29-30, 96.7%
Student Teachers and Governance Board:	31-34, 91.2%	28-30, 93.3%

A survey of the data reveals that many results remained substantially unchanged between the two surveys, particularly those involving homogeneity. Many of these percentages were almost identical. Those that changed became more homogeneous.

There was a downward shift in the overall mean scores, although they remained well within the positive range. Most groups experienced a drop in overall scores of .3 to .5, along with the above increase in homogeneity.

The major significant change was the downward shift of group two (pre-student teachers) to the lowest mean score rank of all the groups. On the revised questionnaire this group scored lowest of all groups on 17 of 30 questions, and second lowest on 10 other questions. On the first survey this group was well up in the middle of the field. This finding obviously has clear implications for those responsible for implementing the HCTEC program with these students.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the survey instrument was changed somewhat for this report, the most obvious recommendation is that another set of data be gathered and examined carefully to see if the same patterns persist.

A strong continuity of results showed up in the comparison of results from the two surveys despite the changes in the instrument. This would also seem to bolster the argument for further exploration of a new set of 1976-77 data, preferably with the same questionnaire this time.

The results appear to show a convergence toward a true picture of the client groups' perceptions of the need for the center to perform the functions listed in the questionnaires. The downward shift may well reveal the settling in toward a true, realistic view of what the HCTEC is (or at least ought to be). This seems especially likely when coupled with the increase in homogeneity, particularly among the major client groups.

Only time, and a third set of data to compare with the other two, will tell. Thus the hope is that all parties concerned will strive to expedite the collection of that data.

The only new recommendation in terms of ongoing HCTEC programming concerns the pre-student teacher group. Apparently some unfavorable perception of the center caused these college students toshift dramatically. The HCTEC council and director need to find out the cause and correct it.

APPENDIX A

TABLE OF RANKED MEAN SCORES

QUESTION

16.

GROUP	4	15	2	7	13	8	3	1	5	6	9	14
MEAN	2.00	3.08	3.20	3.20	3.40	3.47	3.50	3.79	3.88	4.00	4.75	5.00

LSD = 1.08

17.

GROUP	4	2	8	7	1	5	9	13	3	15	6	14
MEAN	2.43	2.75	3.63	3.78	4.04	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.46	4.60	5.00

LSD = 0.88

18.

GROUP	4	2	8	7	1	5	9	13	3	15	6	14
MEAN	2.43	2.75	3.63	3.78	4.04	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.46	4.60	5.00

LSD = 0.88

19.

GROUP	2	8	4	3	5	1	6	13	15	7	9	14
MEAN	3.00	3.63	3.71	3.79	3.86	3.89	4.25	4.30	4.38	4.40	4.67	5.00

LSD = 0.97

20.

GROUP	4	2	8	13	7	1	3	15	5	9	6	14
MEAN	2.86	3.00	3.84	3.85	4.00	4.04	4.23	4.42	4.44	4.75	4.80	5.00

LSD = 0.89

21.

GROUP	2	4	1	7	13	15	5	8	3	9	6	14
MEAN	2.50	3.29	3.54	3.60	3.60	3.69	3.71	3.79	3.86	4.33	4.75	5.00

LSD = 1.15

22.

GROUP	2	4	1	3	8	13	5	15	9	7	6	14
MEAN	2.80	3.14	3.32	3.57	3.58	3.70	3.71	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.20	5.00

LSD = 0.98

23.

GROUP	4	1	2	5	13	3	8	9	6	7	15	14
MEAN	3.00	3.18	3.25	3.43	3.55	3.57	3.63	3.67	3.75	3.90	3.92	5.00

LSD = 1.02

24.

GROUP	4	2	1	3	8	7	5	13	15	6	9	14
MEAN	3.43	3.50	3.89	3.93	3.95	4.40	4.44	4.45	4.69	5.00	5.00	5.00

LSD = 1.00

25.

GROUP	4	2	1	7	8	13	3	15	9	5	6	14
MEAN	2.71	3.00	3.86	3.90	3.94	4.05	4.14	4.15	4.33	4.38	5.00	5.00

LSD = 1.09

26.

GROUP	4	2	13	7	1	8	6	3	5	15	9	14
MEAN	2.57	2.75	3.70	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.25	4.29	4.60	4.62	5.00	5.00

LSD = 1.08

27.

GROUP	2	4	8	1	3	6	13	7	5	15	9	14
MEAN	3.00	3.57	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.33	4.67	4.85	5.00	5.00

LSD = 1.07

28.

GROUP	2	3	8	4	13	1	7	15	6	5	9	14
MEAN	3.40	3.57	3.63	3.71	3.84	3.92	4.20	4.46	4.50	4.71	5.00	5.00

LSD = 1.08

29.

GROUP	2	8	9	13	3	4	1	6	7	15	5	14
MEAN	3.00	3.63	3.67	3.68	3.71	3.71	3.92	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.75	5.00

LSD = 1.23

30.

GROUP	4	2	6	7	13	9	8	1	15	3	5	14
MEAN	2.71	3.00	3.25	3.25	3.42	3.50	3.63	3.67	3.67	3.71	4.33	5.00

LSD = 1.20

QUESTION

1.	GROUP	2	4	3	8	1	7	13	5	15	6	9	14
	MEAN	2.80	3.29	3.93	4.05	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.63	4.92	5.00	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.81												
2.	GROUP	2	4	8	3	15	7	5	13	1	6	9	14
	MEAN	3.40	3.71	3.89	4.00	4.15	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.80	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.89												
3.	GROUP	4	2	15	7	3	8	1	5	13	9	6	14
	MEAN	2.57	3.20	3.46	3.56	3.64	3.68	3.82	3.86	3.90	4.25	4.60	5.00
	LSD = 0.96												
4.	GROUP	2	4	3	8	5	7	1	13	15	6	9	14
	MEAN	2.40	3.29	3.79	3.79	3.89	4.20	4.30	4.35	4.38	4.40	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.90												
5.	GROUP	2	4	3	7	8	5	6	1	13	15	9	14
	MEAN	3.20	3.43	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.33	4.40	4.50	4.53	4.54	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.80												
6.	GROUP	2	4	3	8	15	7	13	5	1	6	9	14
	MEAN	3.00	3.57	3.93	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.10	4.11	4.46	4.80	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.90												
7.	GROUP	2	4	8	13	3	5	7	1	15	6	9	14
	MEAN	2.40	3.00	3.68	3.70	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.40	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.94												
8.	GROUP	2	4	8	5	3	1	7	13	15	9	6	14
	MEAN	2.80	3.71	4.00	4.11	4.21	4.29	4.40	4.55	4.62	4.75	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.87												
9.	GROUP	2	4	7	8	13	15	3	5	1	6	9	14
	MEAN	2.83	3.00	3.11	3.50	3.55	3.75	3.86	3.88	4.07	4.20	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.99												
10.	GROUP	4	2	15	5	7	8	6	3	13	1	9	14
	MEAN	3.14	3.20	3.85	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.39	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 0.93												
11.	GROUP	4	7	2	13	8	15	3	5	1	9	6	14
	MEAN	2.43	2.89	3.00	3.25	3.74	3.85	3.86	3.86	3.89	4.33	4.40	5.00
	LSD = 0.89												
12.	GROUP	4	2	7	13	8	1	5	6	3	15	9	14
	MEAN	2.57	3.40	3.40	3.85	4.05	4.07	4.11	4.20	4.21	4.31	4.50	5.00
	LSD = 0.92												
13.	GROUP	2	4	5	1	15	13	8	9	7	3	6	14
	MEAN	3.40	3.43	3.57	3.69	3.85	3.90	3.95	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.40	5.00
	LSD = 0.92												
14.	GROUP	2	7	4	3	13	15	5	1	8	6	9	14
	MEAN	2.75	3.00	3.14	3.31	3.40	3.46	3.50	3.56	3.68	4.00	4.33	5.00
	LSD = 0.98												
15.	GROUP	2	4	7	8	15	3	6	13	1	5	9	14
	MEAN	2.75	3.00	3.33	3.42	3.54	3.79	3.80	3.80	4.04	4.83	5.00	5.00
	LSD = 1.05												

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Needs Assessment for Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia

Listed below are fifteen categories of influential groups from whom we are seeking opinions. Please darken the number on the IBM answer form in the identification number section which best applies to you. If you are in group 01, darken 0 in the first row and 1 in the second row. If you are in group 12, darken 1 in the first row and 2 in the second row, and so forth. If you have completed this form for one group or center, do not respond a second time.

1. Classroom teacher active this semester in an established Teacher Education Center.

   Subject area _____ Years experience _____

2. Pre-student teacher: College _____ Subject Area _____

3. Student Teacher: College _____ Subject Area _____

4. College supervisor of student teachers:

   Subject Area _____ Education Department _____

5. County administrators (superintendents)

6. County supervisors/specialists

7. College administrators (deans, etc.)

8. Elementary School Principal

9. Secondary School Principal

10. School-Based Coordinators

11. RESA Director

12. County Agency (scouts, county councils, Job Corps, etc.)

13. State Department (Superintendent, Deputy, Five Assistant Superintendents, and 100% Division of Professional Development Systems)

14. Center Directors and Staff

15. Center Governance Council

On the back of the IBM form, please state following information, only if it applies to you.

Name of College or University _____

County _____

Subject Area _____

Year of College Field Experience: _____ Freshman; _____ Sophomore;

_____ Junior; _____ Senior; _____ Other

Please rate each of the following items. Darken the IBM space which corresponds with your perceptions as to "What a teacher education center <u>should</u> be in West Virginia" with respect to various functions and activities that should be involved in a teacher education center.

THE CENTER SHOULD:

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
1.	Facilitate the assignment of student teachers through a planned and coordinated system of recruitment and selection of qualified cooperating teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Provide the pre-student teacher with a greater variety of public school experience prior to student teaching.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Provide a wide variety of clinical enrichment experiences in community agencies for prospective teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Provide a program which fosters personal and professional growth for preservice teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Make available to student teachers selected teacher education resource materials.	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Make available selected teacher education resource materials to teachers in those schools which participate in the clinical program.	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Serve as a vehicle through which information and communication flow among all persons involved in teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Evaluate continuously its program to facilitate desirable change.	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Encourage colleges to collect and share evaluative data on the success of graduates by employing appropriate follow-up procedures.	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Provide a clinical experience in which the cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and student teacher plan, teach, and evaluate as a team.	5	4	3	2	1

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
11.	Assist in the development and initiation of new and changing roles of teachers and college personnel in teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Promote the introduction of new teaching techniques into the cooperating schools and member colleges.	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Cooperate with public schools in implementing changes in their instructional programs.	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Encourage the identification of the role of school-based coordinator.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Provide a program of assistance in job placement for participating prospective teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Promote an interchange of personnel between colleges and public schools.	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Involve college personnel who can furnish support and expertise in all areas pertaining to teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Operate under an organizational structure/governing body that delineates its functions, duties, responsibilities and lines of authority.	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Insure adequate representation in its governing body of all parties (schools, colleges, professional organizations, state department, community, student teachers, etc.) concerned with teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Provide a forum through which public school and college personnel can share any evidence of needed change in teacher education programs.	5	4	3	2	1
21.	Provide a structure through which the public school, the college, and the State Department of Education become a consortium for teacher education within a specified region of the state.	5	4	3	2	1
22.	Develop operating patterns and governing procedures which insure a balanced participation of consortium members.	5	4	3	2	1

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
23.	Insure participation of consortium members in the governance, operation and financing of Centers in proportion to benefits received (parity principle).	5	4	3	2	1
24.	Provide cooperating teachers with inservice training designed to enhance competencies to supervise a student teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
25.	Provide an inservice program which is cooperatively planned to meet the needs of both public school and college personnel.	5	4	3	2	1
26.	Provide inservice programs which help teacher educators keep abreast of current trends in teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
	Facilitate inservice and continuing education experiences for:					
27.	Cooperating teachers	5	4	3	2	1
28.	Principals of schools having student teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
29.	Supervisors and administrators in county systems involved in the teacher education center.	5	4	3	2	1
30.	Teachers and other education personnel in counties and schools not presently involved in a teacher education center.	5	4	3	2	1

11-18-75/rmv

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Classroom Supervising Teacher/Cooperating Teacher - regularly employed public or private elementary, early childhood or secondary teacher or a representative of a related community agency who works with student teachers.

2. Clinical Experience - one of a number of terms used to describe the many activities of prospective teachers while they are involved in supervised experiences in the field.

3. College Aide - prospective teacher in a pre-student teaching clinical field experience which is more comprehensive than that of a tutor.

4. College Supervisor - person employed by a college to work with clinical supervising or cooperating teachers and prospective teachers in the field.

5. Community Aide - paraprofessional aide working in a school setting on a volunteer basis as part of an instructional team.

6. Continuing Education - a program that is based on individual self-improvement after entrance into the profession.

7. Inservice - the term used to identify credit or noncredit activities (usually presented in the school or district) designed to affect the attitudes, perceptions and/or behaviors of teacher educators while they are successfully employed.

8. Preservice - the term used to denote the undergraduate teacher education program.

9. Prospective Teacher - candidate of teacher education who studies teaching and will engage in experiences in colleges, schools and/or the community.

10. Resource Center for Teacher Education - designated place which houses teacher education materials and media supplied by the teacher education center.

11. School-Based Coordinator - an outstanding supervising teacher who has been identified by schools and colleges to coordinate teacher education programs, conduct seminars for prospective teachers and establish an educational resource center in each School Center for teacher education.

12. School Centers/Center Schools - schools cooperatively identified by colleges and the school system, which are committed to experimentation and innovation in teacher education.

13. Teacher Education Center - a consortium of colleges and/or universities, public school systems and the West Virginia State Department of Education, offering a program designed to improve the quality of teacher education.

14. Teacher Educator - anyone involved in the preparation and development of teachers.

15. Tutor - prospective teacher engaged in a clinical field experience of a purely tutorial nature working one-to-one or with a small group of students in a school setting.